

REMARKS

Claims 4, 7-9, 13 and 16-26 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 7, 13, 16, 20 and 24 are amended herein.

Final Rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 4, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24 and 25 are finally rejected as being anticipated by Maturi et al ("Maturi"). Claims 4, 7, 13, 16, 20, and 24 have been amended to specifically point out that the receiver circuit and the decoder circuit are coupled only through a bus in the host computer. As the examiner explains in the final office action (Par. 1), it is clear from Fig. 3 of Maturi that the receiver circuit (identified by the examiner as "bit-stream in" and pre-parser 22) is coupled to the decoder circuits (video decoder 26 and audio decoder 28) through bus 36. See also, for example, col. 5, lines 50-56. However, it is also readily apparent that bus 36 is not in the host computer 18, but is contained within the decoder unit 16. As argued in the reply to the first Office Action, Maturi is therefore directed to the internal synchronization in decoder 16 and does not anticipate or suggest synchronization of a receiver circuit and decoder circuit that are segregated and coupled only through separate nodes of a bus in the host computer. The amendments made herein to the rejected independent claims, and thereby incorporated in the rejected dependent claims, specifically add this limitation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present amendment places the rejected claims in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal and may be entered under 37 CFR 1.116.

Final Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 9, 18, 22, and 26 are rejected as being obvious over Maturi. Claims 19 and 23 are rejected as being obvious over Maturi in further view of Dokic US 5699392. Each of these claims are dependent on one of the amended independent claims discussed above. Therefore, these claims incorporate the added limitation that the receiver circuit and the decoder circuit are coupled only through a bus in the host computer. As discussed, Maturi neither discloses or suggests this limitation, nor does Dokic. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted

Appl. No. 09/650,329
Office Action dated February 25, 2004
Amendment dated April 23, 2004

PATENT

that this amendment avoids the rejection and places the rejected claims in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Mart C. Matthews
Reg. No. 26,201

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: (303) 571-4000
Fax: (303) 571-4321
MCM/cl
60201454 v1